

**REMARKS:**

Claims 1-31 are currently pending in the application. Claims 1-4, 22, 26 and 28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over U.S. Patent No. 4,464,554 to Bakanowski ("Bakanowski") in view of Toppan (JP 63-317068) ("Toppan") or U.S. Patent No. 5,825,000 to Jun ("Jun").

Claims 29 and 30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Bakanowski in view of Toppan and U.S. Patent No. 4,480,164 to Dills ("Dills").

Claims 5-16, 23-25 and 31 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Bakanowski, in view of Toppan or Jun as applied to claims 1-4, 22, 26 and 28, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 2,704,802 to Blass ("Blass") or U.S. Patent No. 3,210,511 to Smith ("Smith").

Claims 17-21 and 27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Bakanowski in view of Toppan or Jun as applied to claims 1-4, 22, 26 and 28 in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,369,250 to Meredith ("Meredith").

New Claims 32-37 have been added; claim 30 has been cancelled.

**Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

3. Claims 1-4, 22, 26 and 28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Bakanowski et al in view of Toppan or Jun.

Applicant has amended claims 1, 3, 22, 26 and 28.

Bakanowski fails to teach or suggest a combination speed cooking oven utilizing hot air for heating and waveguides at opposite sides of the oven cooking chamber wherein the hot air and microwaves are launched from the same opposing sides of the

cooking chamber. Further, Bakanowski fails to show microwave energy launched from the sides of the oven cavity toward the low-profile sides of the food product. A person of ordinary skill would believe it more desirable to launch from the top and/or the bottom of the oven cavity to obtain uniform cooking of the food product. Jun teaches rotation of the food product, col. 3, lines 52-57. Applicant's invention teaches speed cooking of a food product without rotation of the food within the oven cavity. Additionally, as described elsewhere herein, applicant's invention teaches speed cooking of a food product **without any movement of the food product relative to the electromagnetic energy source**. Further, Toppan teaches sterilization of a substance, not speed cooking. Applicant respectfully disagrees that Bakanowski alone, or in combination with Toppan or Jun or any other references teaches applicant's invention. No suggestion exists within any of the cited art that would suggest such combination.

4. Claims 29 and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Bakanowski in view of Toppan or Jun as applied to claims 1-4, 22, 26, and 28 and further in view of Dills.

Applicant has amended claims 1, 3, 22, 26 and 28.

Bakanowski fails to teach or suggest a combination speed cooking oven utilizing hot air for heating and waveguides at opposite sides of the oven cooking chamber wherein the hot air and microwaves are launched from the same opposing sides of the cooking chamber. Further, Bakanowski and Dills fail to show microwave energy launched from the sides of the oven cavity toward the low-profile sides of the food product. A person of ordinary skill would believe it more desirable to launch from the

top and/or the bottom of the oven cavity to obtain uniform cooking of the food product.

Dills teaches the requirement of a quarter-wave transformer, col. 3, lines 37, 38.

As detailed previously, Bakanowski alone, or in combination with Jun, Toppan or further in view of Dills does not teach applicant's invention and no suggestion exists within any of the cited references that would suggest such combination.

5. Claims 5-16, 23-25 and 31 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Bakanowski, in view of Toppan or Jun as applied to claims 1-4, 22, 26 and 28 and further in view of Blass or Smith.

Applicant has amended claims 1, 3, 22, 26 and 28.

Bakanowski fails to teach or suggest a combination speed cooking oven utilizing hot air for heating and waveguides at opposite sides of the oven cooking chamber wherein the hot air and microwaves are launched from the same opposing sides of the cooking chamber. Further, Bakanowski fails to show microwave energy launched from the sides of the oven cavity toward the low-profile sides of the food product. A person of ordinary skill would believe it more desirable to launch from the top and/or the bottom of the oven cavity to obtain uniform cooking of the food product. Neither Blass or Smith teach speed cooking of a food product utilizing hot air for heating and waveguides at opposite sides of the oven cooking chamber wherein the hot air and microwaves are launched from the same opposing sides of the cooking chamber. For the reasons cited above, Bakanowski in combination with either Toppan or Jun or further in view of Blass or Smith does not teach applicant's invention and no suggestion exists within any of the cited references that would suggest such combination.

6. Claims 17-21 and 27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Bakanowski, in view of Toppan or Jun as applied to claims 1-4, 22, 26 and 28 and further in view of Meredith.

Applicant has amended claims 1, 3, 22, 26 and 28.

Again, Bakanowski fails to teach or suggest a combination speed cooking oven utilizing hot air for heating and waveguides at opposite sides of the oven cooking chamber wherein the hot air and microwaves are launched from the same opposing sides of the cooking chamber. Further, Bakanowski fails to show microwave energy launched from the sides of the oven cavity toward the low-profile sides of the food product. A person of ordinary skill would believe it more desirable to launch from the top and/or the bottom of the oven cavity to obtain uniform cooking of the food product. Applicant refers again to the previous discussion of Toppan and Jun. Further, Meredith teaches movement of the food product relative to the slot configuration, col. 3, lines 37-53. Movement of a food product relative to the electromagnetic energy is a requirement sought to be avoided by applicant's invention. Applicant respectfully disagrees that Bakanowski alone, or in combination with Toppan or Jun and further in view of Meredith or any other reference teaches applicant's invention. No suggestion exists within any of the cited art that would suggest such combination.

Applicant respectfully submits that by amending claims 1-29 and 31 the Examiner's rejection based upon 35 U.S.C. 103(a) is moot.

Therefore, the Applicant submits that claims 1-29 and 31-37 are now in condition for allowance, and respectfully requests that claims 1-29 and 31-37 be allowed.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Dean W. Russell". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first name "Dean" being more prominent.

Dean W. Russell  
Reg. No. 33,452

OF COUNSEL:

Kilpatrick Stockton LLP  
Suite 2800  
1100 Peachtree Street  
Atlanta, GA 30309  
404.815.6528 phone  
404.541.3375 fax